

FILED
LODGED
RECEIVED
MAIL

APR 25 2011

AT SEATTLE
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
BY DEPUTY

District Court - is
and made a mistake;
This case is the same
as since Feb. 2011 and
a civil Cover Sheet;
Mr. Simonds is notifying
the Court on this civil
Cover Sheet the Stalos
and have changed of
his complaints have
stated such and
notified the Court;
So this civil Cover
Sheet; shall do so;
on the amount;
amount; Demand;
Statement of fact;

Mr. Simonds
April 23rd 2011



11-CV-00360-MISC

Complaint -
C 11-10360 R.S.L

U.S. District Judge
Lochner failed to
state the truth on
all Complaints - this
case facts - sufficient
U.S. District Judge
Lochner knows the law -
on all Complaints;
alleging cases do more;
including Mr. Simonds's
Statement - he is
using Dish Network
on all evidence -
stated, on the first
Complaint, Complaint;
Feb. 25th 2011,
U.S. District Judge
failed to decide -
Complaint - Objections
as more; do answer
etc. Judge Lochner;

U.S. District Judge
Gashnick has failed
therefore to know a
cause of action exists
as more; just another
delay tactic

U.S. District Judge
has violated
Statute - Article
3 Jurisdiction as
more; his order
dated - April 12th
2011

Appellant - 00
Mr. Simonds is
joining Juicing Dish
Network on all
Complaints evidence
copies; etc. documents
etc. as more; more;
Attachments of fact
823 p^{2nd} 831, 840 -
material facts
this Complaint states;

U.S. District Judge
Lashik failed to
admit to case -
823 P2nd 831, 840
CJ, more; material
fact; his order of
delay tactics Apoil
14th 2011,

U.S. District Judge
Lashik has
demonstrated lack
of the law - the motion
Order to Show Cause

This complaint states
he is using DISh
Network based on
all complaints -
evidence - documentary
etc as more;
Apoil 14th 2011;
Claim - 5th amendment
U.S.C.M. Due
process as more;

findings of fact,
and conclusions of
law -

all documents, evidence
cases, etc, Complaints
387 F^{2nd} 264,

667 F^{2nd} 953 -
number 8 - demonstrates
claim; antifraud

All complaints -
demonstrate to sue
defendants. Defendant
discrimination - document
U.S.C. 47 153 (44, 46)
and claim, alleges,
demonstrates such - etc.

Sue defendants - on
fraud - 823 P^{2nd} 831,
840 - perpetuate fraud -
and cases - suing their
corporate veil - 44 P^{3rd}
556,

U.S. District Judge
does not understand-
the complaint any or all
this is fine; however, Judge Lashik
should know facts
before submission to
Mr. Simonds, and
delay facts or deny
delay Mr. Simonds
his belief; is not the
law etc.

Defendant is being
sued on the law
based on the law;
The complaint which
cites this case -
823 P 2nd 831, 840,
states or says:
material facts
Therefore Mr. Simonds
not convinced Judge
~~that~~ knows the law -
or more, demonstrates

he should be assigned this case;
documents pg 5-
274-not 500 case⁽⁵⁾
16, 19, pg-275-20, 21,
22, 24, Judge 5 00 do do
dated - April 12th 2011
and attached

documents as more;
evidence rules-

~~the process of law~~

Mr. Simonds's
demands for
judgement = 28-1361-

\$ 400 million Dollars-
on April 29th 2011

When Judge has
concluded all
complaints as he's
accepted the fact
on all complaints to
sue defendant - Dish

Mr. Simonds shall
cancel pg - 274, 275,
which is the second
time - these documents
attached to - Complaint
objection; 1st time,
1st Judge must answer
to Mr. Simonds;

and 2nd -

Judge must answer
this Complaint, entire-
any delay, shall
answer part to Judge

nature of claims -
5th Amendment - U.S. C.A.
Due Process -
Mr. Simonds

April 15th 2011

Colorado Consumer
Protection Act
and document-etc

- ① that defendant engaged in unfair or deceptive trade practice
- ② that challenged practice occurred in course of defendant's business or occupation
- ③ that it significantly impacts the public, as actual or potential consumers of defendant's defendant's goods, services, or property

Pieces 2nd Page the veil
P 176 to sue
defendants

④

That plaintiff suffered
injury in fact to legally
protected interests

⑤

That challenged practice
caused plaintiff's
injury

969 P2nd 225, 226
number - 13;

Judge Lashik violated
Due Process -
U.S. C. A. 5th
amendment - claim
as made; order -
GPO 127 2011
GPO 127 2011-00000

Judge Lashik violated
Federal rules of
evidence - 101, 102, 103,

201, as more
findings of fact and
conclusions of law
on all Complaints,
documentary evidence
and cases - etc
387 F 2nd 269;

Mr. Simonds's objections
Complaint - document attached
U.S.P.C. W.A. WSE

Which means - claims as
more; Mr. Simonds
would like this document
returned to him, etc more;
Mr. Simonds

4742 18th Ave. N.E.
Seattle Wash. 98105
(April 15th 2011)

Claim - above - 8-a-1, 8-a-2,
8-a-3, demand for
Judgement - April 29th 2011

§ 10.03

JUDICIAL CONDUCT AND ETHICS

§ 10.03

regard specifically to social and private activities, Canon 2B cautions that a judge should not allow family or social relationships to influence judicial conduct,¹³ and Canon 5A permits a judge to engage in the arts, sports, and other social and recreational activities only if they "do not detract from the dignity of his office or interfere with the performance of his judicial duties."¹⁴ Other canons govern the related issues of disqualification and conflict of interest.¹⁵

The policy justifications for placing restrictions on off-the-bench activities generally fall into the following broad categories: (1) the need to avoid the appearance of partiality, favoritism, or other misuse of public office,¹⁶ (2) the need to maintain public confidence in the women and men who comprise the judiciary;¹⁷ and (3) the need to ensure that judges will not be distracted by nonjudicial activities.¹⁸

§ 10.03. — Appearance of Favoritism

The need for the judiciary to avoid the appearance of partiality exists even in the absence of actual wrongdoing or favoritism. In a democracy, the enforcement of judicial decrees and orders ultimately depends upon public cooperation. The level of cooperation, in turn, depends upon a widely held perception that judges decide cases impartially.¹⁹ This is one meaning of the frequently used phrase "confidence in the

- A. A judge should respect and comply with the law and should conduct himself at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary.
- B. A judge should not allow his family, social, or other relationships to influence his judicial conduct or judgment. He should not lend the prestige of his office to advance the private interests of others; nor should he convey the impression that they are in a special position to influence him. He should not testify voluntarily as a character witness.

13. *Id.*, Canon 2B.

14. *Id.*, Canon 5A.

15. *Id.*, Canons 3C & 3D. See Chapter Five.

16. See *In re Morrissey*, 366 Mass. 11, 313 N.E.2d 878 (1974); Acheson, *Removing the Shadow Cast on the Courts*, 55 A.B.A.J. 919, 920 (1969); *Judicial Ethics*, 50 A.B.A.J. 840, 841 (1964); Note, *Extrajudicial Activities of Judges*, 47 Iowa L. Rev. 1026, 1029 (1962).

17. See Cribbet, *The Public Activities of a Judge*, 51 Chi. B. Rev. 78, 79 (1969); Hall, *Judicial Removal for Off-Bench Behavior: Why?*, 21 J. Pub. L. 127, 146.

18. See *In re DeSaulnier*, 360 Mass. 787, 279 N.E.2d 296 (1972); Kaufman, *Lions or Jackals: The Function of a Code of Judicial Ethics*, 35 Law & Contemp. Probs. 3, 5 (1970); McKay, *The Judiciary and Nonjudicial Activities*, 35 Law & Contemp. Probs. 9, 19 (1970); Stern, Comment [on Judicial Ethics], 19 Univ. of Chi. Law School Conference Ser. 17 (1964).

19. See Rifkind, *The Public Concern in a Judge's Private Life*, 19 Univ. of Chi. Law School Conference Ser. 25 (1964); Wright, Comment [on Judicial Ethics], 19 Univ. of Chi. Law School Conference Ser. 39 (1964).

Closely related to the appearance of partiality or self-interest is the issue of collateral misuse of the judicial office. Although the integrity of the judging process may not be directly compromised, it is considered improper for a judge to take advantage of his or her position and title in order to advance an economic, political, social, or other interest.²³ Furthermore, it is considered improper for a judge to even to appear to do

10.04. — Collateral Misuse of Office

judicially.”²⁰ If this confidence were lost, the judicial system could not function. Should the citizenry conclude, even erroneously, that cases were decided on the basis of favoritism or prejudice rather than accord- ing to law and fact, then regimens would be necessary to enforce judgments. Consequently, judges are called upon to avoid all activity that so much as suggests that their rulings are tempered by favoritism or self-interest. This is a prophylactic measure that goes beyond the need for judges to recuse themselves from cases in which they actually have a stake or interest.²¹ Rather, the goal of the policy is to prohibit judges from engaging in certain activities that are deemed inherently inconsistent with the appearance of impartiality.

